

Application No.: 09/381,061
Attorney Docket No.: FUK-59
RCE Submission Dated: April 4, 2005
Reply for Final Office Action Dated: October 3, 2003

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-10 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 4-10 stand rejected, while Claim 3 stands under objection.

In the Final Office Action dated October 10, 2003, the Examiner provided the following indication of allowable subject matter:

"New claim 10 would be considered allowable if amended to recite that all of the fine suppression pores are located radially further away from the center of the floating unit surface than the centering pores and the rotational pores. This will clarify the relationship between the suppression pores and the centering and rotation pores that applicants intend to claim." (Page 3, second paragraph).

Applicant has amended base Claims 1, 7, and 8 in accord with the Examiner's suggestion noted above. Regarding Claims 7 and 8, Applicant notes that the added "wherein" clauses do not reference centering pores (as in Claim 1) since these claims do not recite centering pores (as does Claim 1). Claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of parent Claim 1 (in part) from which it formerly depended. Claim 5 likewise has been amended in accord with the Examiner's suggestion noted above. Other minor revisions have been made to the claims. Claim 10 has been cancelled.

The claim amendments made herein add no new matter and are fully supported by the original disclosure.

Applicant believes that Claims 1 and 3-10 (as amended) are now patentable over the cited art of record.

The following rejections appeared in the Final Office Action.

Application No.: 09/381,061
Attorney Docket No.: FUK-59
RCE Submission Dated: April 4, 2005
Reply for Final Office Action Dated: October 3, 2003

Claims 1, 4-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Hiura.

Claims 1, 4-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiura in view of Kisa (subsequently withdrawn).

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiura in view of Kisa, and taken further in view of Bok, Granneman, Aschner, or Maruyama (subsequently withdrawn).

Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Granneman in view of Hiura, Kisa and Foster.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Granneman in view of Hiura, Kisa and Foster, and further in view of Nishitani and White.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Aschner or Maruyama.

Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over either Aschner or Maruyama, and in further view of Kisa (subsequently withdrawn).

By the Examiner's Answer dated December 14, 2004, in furtherance of simplifying the issues for appeal, the Examiner has withdrawn the rejection of Claims 1, 4-8 and 10 under 35 USC §103(a) over Hiura in view of Kisa; the rejection of Claims 8-9 under 35 USC §103(a) over Hiura in view of Kisa, and further in view of Bok, Granneman, Aschner, or Maruyama; and the rejection of Claims 7-9 under 35 USC §103(a) over either Aschner or Maruyama, and in further view of Kisa.

Application No.: 09/381,061
Attorney Docket No.: FUK-59
RCE Submission Dated: April 4, 2005
Reply for Final Office Action Dated: October 3, 2003

In view of the claim amendments made herein, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 3-10 are patentable over the cited art of record, and requests that the various rejections be withdrawn.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 3 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has indicated that it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Applicant believes that Claim 3 is patentable as it depends from patentably distinguishable base Claim 1 (as amended). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable action in accordance therewith.

Application No.: 09/381,061
Attorney Docket No.: FUK-59
RCE Submission Dated: April 4, 2005
Reply for Final Office Action Dated: October 3, 2003

If the Examiner has any questions or comments that would advance prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 260/484-4526.

Respectfully Submitted,


Randall J. Knuth
Registration No. 34,644

RJK/jrw2

Enclosures: Amendments to the Claims
(5 Sheets)
Explanatory Cover Sheet - Page 1
Return Postcard
check 8370 (\$790.)

Customer No.: 022855
RANDALL J. KNUTH, P.C.
4921 DeSoto Drive
Fort Wayne, IN 46815
Telephone (260) 484-4526
Facsimile (260) 484-0185
Email: rjknuth@rjkpc.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on: April 4, 2005.


Randall J. Knuth, Registration No. 34,644

April 4, 2005
Date